



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/894,854	06/27/2001	Rodrigo Garces	011727-92.00US		
20350	7590 07/15/2005		EXAMINER		
	D AND TOWNSEND A	GESESSE,	GESESSE, TILAHUN		
TWO EMBAI	RCADERO CENTER OOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANC	ISCO, CA 94111-3834		2684		

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/894,8	54	GARCES ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examine	Г	Art Unit					
			. Gesessse	2684					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION IN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNION IN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	CATION.  of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no exumication.  of days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the app	vent, however, may a reply be tim tutory minimum of thirty (30) days vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from blication to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>2/25/05</u> .							
2a)□	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
3)□	,—								
Dispositi	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	<ul> <li>☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>☐ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) 1 and 10-13 is/are rejected.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) 2-9 and 14-21 is/are objected to.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>								
Applicati	ion Papers								
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
2)	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F r No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	O-152)				

Art Unit: 2684

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alanara et al (US patent No. 6,067,460) in view of Laborde et al (US patent No. 5,857,154).

Regarding claim 1, Alanara teaches a wireless communication system having mobile subscriber units within a single wireless network (see figure 2) that may be in either static or mobile modes when operation (abstract) within the single network and a plurality of fixed network devices located at cell sites (cell 1 and 2).

Alanara teaches communicating with both static and mobile subscriber units within the single network (see column 7, line 9-column 12 line 56 and figure 3 and 4), a method for acquiring and managing a plurality of communication modes at each subscriber unit comprising:

Alanara discloses first sensing whether the subscriber unit is static or mobile from the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby network devices (see figure 4).

Art Unit: 2684

Alanara differs in teaching enabling an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit. However, Laborde teaches enabling "multi-protocol" an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit (see abstract). Since, Alanara indicates that provide a signaling protocol between base station and mobile station based on motion (see column 8, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to enable protocol suitable to stationary or moving subscriber unit, as evidenced by Laborade, in order to execute the communication using proper status of the subscriber with proper protocol suitable static or mobile state of the subscriber.

Claim 10, it is a system claim which corresponds to system claim 1 above. Therefore, it is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as set forth in the claim.

Regarding claim 11, Alanara teaches a wireless communication system having mobile subscriber units within a single wireless network (see figure 2) that may be in either static or mobile modes when operation (abstract) within the single network and a plurality of fixed network devices located at cell sites (cell 1 and 2).

Alanara teaches communicating with both static and mobile subscriber units within the single network (see column 7, line 9-column 12 line 56 and figure 3 and 4), a method for acquiring and managing a plurality of communication modes at each subscriber unit comprising:

Art Unit: 2684

Alanara discloses first sensing whether the subscriber unit is static or mobile from the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby network devices (see figure 4).

Alanara differs in teaching enabling an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit. However, Laborde teaches enabling "multi-protocol" an acquisition protocol suited to static mode and mobile mode for said subscriber unit (see abstract). Since, Alanara indicates that provide a signaling protocol between base station and mobile station based on motion (see column 8, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to enable protocol suitable to stationary or moving subscriber unit, as evidenced by Laborade, in order to execute the communication using proper status of the subscriber with proper protocol suitable static or mobile state of the subscriber.

Regarding claim 12, it is a system claim which corresponds to system claim 1 above. Therefore, it is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as set forth in the claim.

Regarding claim 13, Alanara teaches the subscriber unit is sensed as static or mobile based on the nature and quality of the communication links with nearby networks devices (see figure 4 and measuring the signal strength of neighboring cells or scanning signal strength of cells).

Art Unit: 2684

## Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-9,14-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach initiating procedures to change acquisition mode from static mode to mobile mode upon failure of the subscriber unit to sense a pre-selected number of consecutive scheduled polling packets sent by a linked device.

### Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tilahun B Gesesse whose telephone number is 571-272-7879. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-2738300.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TILAHUN GESESSE